

## Summit Staging Area Planning (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700524

### A. Statement of Planning Objectives

This project will fund planning efforts for the development of the Summit Staging Area.

NEPA will be completed to analyze alternatives for development of this staging area. The Summit OHV Staging area is used by over 200 vehicles on busy weekends. Resource impacts occur from this intense use. Analysis of alternatives to develop this staging area is the first step in identifying and minimizing resource impacts that may be occurring.

### B. Relation of Proposed Project to OHV Recreation

The proposed project will conduct an environmental analysis to improve the Summit Staging Area. The staging area is currently being used as an access point for OHV riding opportunities. Use exceeds 200 vehicles on busy weekends. There are no facilities at the staging area. Development of the staging area will enhance and sustain OHV recreation and opportunity by ensuring that use occurs in an appropriate manner and in appropriate locations.

### C. Statement of Activities

The SBNF plans to conduct the following activities in analyzing the Summit Staging Area:

- Internal review of potential alternatives for Summit Staging Area by creating a forest Inter-disciplinary (ID) team.
- Public scoping and any necessary public meetings
- Specialist surveys and supporting reports required for an environmental assessment including a biological assessment/evaluation (including botany and wildlife), archaeological assessment and report, recreation, air quality, fire risk, soil and water, visual resources, and transportation facilities analysis
- Consultation with supporting agencies: County of San Bernardino, USFWS, SHPO
- Production of an Environmental Analysis and Decision Memo with a management plan for Summit Staging Area

### D. List of Reports

An Environmental Assessment (EA) is the ultimate goal of this proposal. Supporting documents will include:

- project initiation letter
- public record memo
- biological assessment/evaluation
- cultural resources/archaeological report and SHPO consultation
- hydrology/soils report
- recreation analysis
- fire risk assessment
- air quality report
- transportation facilities report
- visual resources

After an EA is produced, a Decision Memo will be written which shall identify the alternative to be implemented. A management plan for the area should be included with the final decision.

## Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700524

**1. Timeline for Completion**

Attachments:

[Proposed Timeline - Summit Staging](#)

**2. Optional Project-Specific Application Documents**

**3. Optional Project-specific Maps**

## Project Cost Estimate

|                              |   |   |               |
|------------------------------|---|---|---------------|
| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:         |   | Version # _____                             | APP # _____   |
| <b>APPLICANT NAME :</b>      | USFS - San Bernardino National Forest   |   |               |
| <b>PROJECT TITLE :</b>       | Summit Staging Area Planning (FINAL)  | <b>PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :</b> | G09-02-14-P03 |
| <b>PROJECT TYPE :</b>        | <input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations<br><input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning <input type="checkbox"/> Restoration  |   |               |
| <b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION :</b> | <p>This project will fund planning efforts for the development of the Summit Staging Area.</p> <p>NEPA will be completed to analyze alternatives for development of this staging area. The Summit OHV Staging area is used by over 200 vehicles on busy weekends. Resource impacts occur from this intense use. Analysis of alternatives to develop this staging area is the first step in identifying and minimizing resource impacts that may be occurring.</p> |   |               |

|                         | Line Item                                    | Qty   | Rate    | UOM | Grant Request | Match  | Total    |
|-------------------------|--|-------|---------|-----|---------------|--------|----------|
| <b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>  |  |       |         |     |               |        |          |
| <b>Program Expenses</b> |  |       |         |     |               |        |          |
| 1                       | <b>Staff</b>                                 |       |         |     |               |        |          |
|                         | Other-District Archaeologist<br>Notes : Doan | 6.000 | 356.830 | DAY | 2,141.00      | 0.00   | 2,141.00 |
|                         | Other-Forest Planner<br>Notes : Hall         | 1.000 | 265.910 | DAY | 0.00          | 266.00 | 266.00   |
|                         | Other-OHV Program Manager<br>Notes : Hoffman | 3.000 | 292.820 | DAY | 878.00        | 0.00   | 878.00   |
|                         | Other-Forest Botanist<br>Notes : Lardner     | 1.000 | 468.470 | DAY | 468.00        | 0.00   | 468.00   |
|                         | Other-District Rec Staff<br>Notes : Lyon     | 8.000 | 320.430 | DAY | 2,563.00      | 0.00   | 2,563.00 |
|                         | Other-Tribal Relations                       | 1.000 | 422.000 | DAY | 422.00        | 0.00   | 422.00   |

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: USFS - San Bernardino National Forest  
Application: Summit Staging Area Planning (FINAL)

3/1/2010

|          | Line Item  | Qty   | Rate     | UOM | Grant Request | Match    | Total     |
|----------|--|-------|----------|-----|---------------|----------|-----------|
|          | Notes : McCarthy                                   |       |          |     |               |          |           |
|          | Other-District Wildlife Biologist<br>Notes : Meyer | 5.000 | 395.070  | DAY | 1,975.00      | 0.00     | 1,975.00  |
|          | Other-District Botanist<br>Notes : Nelson, D       | 5.000 | 313.730  | DAY | 1,569.00      | 0.00     | 1,569.00  |
|          | Other-Archaeologist<br>Notes : Nelson, H           | 5.000 | 268.880  | DAY | 1,344.00      | 0.00     | 1,344.00  |
|          | Other-Forest Archaeologist<br>Notes : Sapp         | 1.000 | 439.060  | DAY | 0.00          | 439.00   | 439.00    |
|          | Other-Archaeologist<br>Notes : Scrivner            | 5.000 | 298.760  | DAY | 1,494.00      | 0.00     | 1,494.00  |
|          | Other-Deputy DR<br>Notes : Thornburgh              | 5.000 | 492.130  | DAY | 0.00          | 2,461.00 | 2,461.00  |
|          | Other-District Recreation<br>Notes : Uthus         | 5.000 | 257.230  | DAY | 1,286.00      | 0.00     | 1,286.00  |
|          | <b>Total for Staff</b>                             |       |          |     | 14,140.00     | 3,166.00 | 17,306.00 |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Contracts</b>                                   |       |          |     |               |          |           |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Materials / Supplies</b>                        |       |          |     |               |          |           |
|          | Other-Misc Supplies                                | 1.000 | 50.000   | EA  | 50.00         | 0.00     | 50.00     |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Equipment Use Expenses</b>                      |       |          |     |               |          |           |
|          | Other-1/2 Ton Pickup                               | 2.000 | 260.000  | MOS | 0.00          | 520.00   | 520.00    |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Equipment Purchases</b>                         |       |          |     |               |          |           |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Others</b>                                      |       |          |     |               |          |           |
| <b>7</b> | <b>Indirect Costs</b>                              |       |          |     |               |          |           |
|          | Indirect Costs-Indirect Costs                      | 1.000 | 1300.000 | EA  | 0.00          | 1,300.00 | 1,300.00  |

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: USFS - San Bernardino National Forest  
Application: Summit Staging Area Planning (FINAL)

3/1/2010

|                        | Line Item | Qty | Rate | UOM | Grant Request | Match    | Total     |
|------------------------|-----------|-----|------|-----|---------------|----------|-----------|
| Total Program Expenses |           |     |      |     | 14,190.00     | 4,986.00 | 19,176.00 |
| TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES  |           |     |      |     | 14,190.00     | 4,986.00 | 19,176.00 |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES     |           |     |      |     | 14,190.00     | 4,986.00 | 19,176.00 |

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
 Agency: USFS - San Bernardino National Forest  
 Application: Summit Staging Area Planning (FINAL)

3/1/2010

|                               | Line Item              | Grant Request    | Match           | Total            | Narrative |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------|
| <b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>        |                        |                  |                 |                  |           |
| <b>Program Expenses</b>       |                        |                  |                 |                  |           |
| 1                             | Staff                  | 14,140.00        | 3,166.00        | 17,306.00        |           |
| 2                             | Contracts              | 0.00             | 0.00            | 0.00             |           |
| 3                             | Materials / Supplies   | 50.00            | 0.00            | 50.00            |           |
| 4                             | Equipment Use Expenses | 0.00             | 520.00          | 520.00           |           |
| 5                             | Equipment Purchases    | 0.00             | 0.00            | 0.00             |           |
| 6                             | Others                 | 0.00             | 0.00            | 0.00             |           |
| 7                             | Indirect Costs         | 0.00             | 1,300.00        | 1,300.00         |           |
| <b>Total Program Expenses</b> |                        | 14,190.00        | 4,986.00        | 19,176.00        |           |
| <b>TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES</b>  |                        | 14,190.00        | 4,986.00        | 19,176.00        |           |
| <b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>     |                        | <b>14,190.00</b> | <b>4,986.00</b> | <b>19,176.00</b> |           |

## Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700524

### ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

#### ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
(Please select Yes or No)

#### ITEM 2

- b. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

### ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

- c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
(Please select Yes or No)
- d. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- e. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 4 – 10
- This project is to conduct an environmental analysis for development of an OHV staging area. As this is an analysis, no physical impacts to the environment would occur.

### ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

### ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

### ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

### ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

### ITEM 8 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

### ITEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

**ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts**

**CEQA/NEPA Attachment**



## Planning Project Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700524

### 1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is 3

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

☐ 76% or more (10 points)

☐ 51% - 75% (5 points)

☒ 26% - 50% (3 points)

☐ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

### 2. Planning Project - Q 2.

#### A Planning Project - Page 1

2. The Planning Project would address the following 3

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

☐ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on special-status species habitats

☒ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on cultural resources

☒ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on soil conditions

☐ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on water quality

☒ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on other recreation uses

☐ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on adjacent lands.

☐ Potential impact to relationships between OHV Recreation and local residents

☐ Toxic or hazardous materials within a Project Area or adjacent property that may impact OHV Recreation

☒ Trail issues such as traffic patterns, trails closures, appropriate uses, etc.

#### B. Planning Project - Page 2

Explain each statement that was checked

Summit Staging Area has cultural sites adjacent to the project area that are experiencing impacts from OHV use. In addition. Over 200 vehicles use this area on busy weekends, and that traffic is causing soil impacts. The PCT (Pacific Crest Trail) is located nearby so other recreation uses that may be impacted from the OHV use include hiking. Planning for development of a staging area will limit and identify appropriate trail use patterns.

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ 6 or more items checked (4 points)

☒ 4 to 5 items checked (3 points)

☐ 2 to 3 items checked (2 points)

☐ 1 or no items checked (No points)

### 3. Motorized Access - Q 3.

3. The Project would lead to improved facilities that provide motorized access to the following nonmotorized recreation opportunities 4

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each, up to a maximum of 6 points (Please select applicable values)

☐ Camping

☐ Birding

☒ Hiking

☐ Equestrian trails

☐ Fishing

☐ Rock Climbing

☒ Other (Specify) [hunting]

**4. Public Input - Q 4.**

4. The Project proposal was developed with public input employing the following 1

(Check all that apply) Scoring: Maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)  
☐ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)  
☒ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

The forest has routine meetings throughout the year with a group of stakeholders where the group discusses ongoing projects, needs for new projects and the best way to manage OHV use on the forest. This group identified a need for facility development/improvement at Summit Staging Area. This project will analyze alternatives to accomplish this.

**5. Stakeholder Input - Q 5.**

5. If the Project were approved, the planning process would incorporate substantial stakeholder input: 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

If 'Yes', explain, specifically, how it would be 'substantial'. Identify stakeholders

The planning process would include, at a minimum, the necessary public involvement from the NEPA stand point. In addition, the forest will work extensively with users of the area. Potential meetings or field trips will be conducted to provide opportunity to the various publics. The forest will also involve the previously mentioned stakeholder group and local volunteer groups.

**6. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 6.**

6. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 4 or more (4 points) ☐ 2 to 3 (2 points)  
☐ 1 (1 point) ☐ None (No points)

List partner organization(s)

Partners for this project will include the SBNFA (San Bernardino National Forest Association) volunteers, Lytle Creek Volunteer Association, Adopt-a-Trail volunteers and the OHV leadership group.

**7. Sustain OHV Opportunity - Q 7.**

7. The Planning Project sustains OHV Opportunity in the following manner 10

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Project will develop management plans for existing OHV Opportunity (4 points)  
☒ Project will complete environmental review for an OHV Development Project (3 points)  
☒ Project supports development of OHV Opportunities adjacent to population centers (3 points)  
☐ Project supports development of OHV Opportunities in areas that lack legal OHV Opportunity (2 points)  
☐ Project will develop a system of designated OHV routes for an existing OHV Opportunity (2 points)

Explain each statement that was checked

Summit Staging Area is a heavily used OHV staging area located on the Front Country Ranger District of the San Bernardino National Forest. The staging area typically is used by 40 to 80 vehicles per day with up to 200 vehicles on busy weekends. Completed NEPA and a site plan are needed for the staging area to provide the capability to make improvements to the site.

Completion of the NEPA /Planning document for the Summit Staging Area will provide the capability to make improvements to the site and increase resource protection.

The goal for this project is to complete the environmental analysis that will lead to improved OHV opportunities by improving the staging area. OHV users in this area come from San Bernardino, Riverside and Los Angeles counties.

**8. Identification of Funding Sources - Q 8.**

8. Funds for implementing the completed plan have been identified 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ No (No points)

☐ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response

Reference Document

**9. Offsite Impacts - Q 9.**

9. The Planning Project would address offsite impacts relative to the Project Area (e.g., sound, fugitive dust, runoff): 0

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ No (No points)

☐ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response